

February 27, 1986 LB 105, 816, 965, 1004A

and 816 all to Select File, some of those have E & R amendments attached, Mr. President. Your Committee on Government, whose Chair is Senator Landis, reports 965 to General File with committee amendments attached. (See pages 1057-62 of the Legislative Journal.)

And, Mr. President, Senator Landis has a new A bill, 1004A. (Read by title for the first time. See page 1062 of the Journal.) That is all that I have, Mr. President.

SPEAKER NICHOL: All right. We'll move on now to LB 105. Mr. Clerk, where were we when we left it?

CLERK: Mr. President, 105 was a bill that was introduced by Senator Lowell Johnson and others. (Read title.) The bill was considered earlier this week, on February 24 as a matter of fact. At that time there was an amendment from Senator Johnson and Senator Hoagland, a portion of which was adopted. There was an amendment from Senator Chambers that was adopted. We left the bill, Mr. President, with an amendment by Senator Vickers. Senator Vickers' amendment is on page 944 of the Journal.

SPEAKER NICHOL: We are on that Vickers amendment. Senator Vickers, would you like to remind us of what it was about.

SENATOR VICKERS: Mr. President, members, the amendment that I offered changes two words in the Johnson-Hoagland amendment that was adopted on General File. On lines 4, subsection (2) of Section 2, and again on line 10 of that same subsection, where the language says that, "The evidence may be presented by affidavit and shall demonstrate that a significant beneficial relationship exists or has existed in the past," and I changed...this amendment would change the word "or" to "and." And it would do it again in line 10 where it basically the same language. My purpose for this is to indicate that there has to be both circumstances taken into consideration by the court, that there has to have been a previous relationship as well. It seems to me that we ought to be careful that we don't set up a mechanism whereby an individual can petition the court for a relationship when, in fact, there hasn't been a relationship, and for whatever purposes there might have been a disruption in the family to cause that relationship. Now I would remind you that this bill calls for two things, the child's parents to have been deceased, or the marriage to have been dissolved.